arXiv:0710.4875v1 [math.MG] 25 Oct 2007

A discrete version and stability of Brunn Minkowski inequality

Michel Bonnefont
Institut de mathématiques, Laboratoire de Statistique et Probabilités,
Université Paul Sabatier,
118 route de Narbonne,
31062 Toulouse,
FRANCE

February 2, 2008

Abstract

In the first part of the paper, we define an approximated Brunn-Minkowski inequality which generalizes the classical one for length spaces. Our new definition based only on distance properties allows us also to deal with discrete spaces. Then we show the stability of our new inequality under a convergence of metric measure spaces. This result gives as a corollary the stability of the classical Brunn-Minkowski inequality for geodesic spaces. The proof of this stability was done for different inequalities (curvature dimension inequality, metric contraction property) but as far as we know not for the Brunn-Minkowski one.
In the second part of the paper, we show that every metric measure space satisfying classical Brunn-Minkowski inequality can be approximated by discrete spaces with some approximated Brunn-Minkowski inequalities.

1 Introduction

Let us recall some facts about the Brunn-Minkowski inequality. First the inequality was set in $\mathbf{R}^n$ for convex bodies by Brunn and Minkowski in 1887 (for more details about the inequality and its birth, one can refer to the great surveys [1, 5] and the reference therein). It can be read as if K and L are convex bodies (compact convex sets with non empty interior) of $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $0 < t < 1$ then

$$V_n((1-t)K + tL)^{1/n} \geq (1-t)V_n(K)^{1/n} + tV_n(L)^{1/n} \tag{1}$$

where V_n is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $+$ the Minkowski sum which is given by

$$A + B = \{a + b, a \in A, b \in B\}$$

for A and B two sets of $\mathbf{R}^n$. Equality holds if and only if K and L are equals up to translation and dilatation.

Brunn-Minkowski inequality is a very powerful inequality with a lot of applications. For example it implies very quickly the isoperimetric inequality for convex bodies in $\mathbf{R}^n$ which reads

$$\left(\frac{V_n(K)}{V_n(B)}\right)^{1/n} \leq \left(\frac{s(K)}{s(B)}\right)^{1/(n-1)} \tag{2}$$

where K is a convex body of $\mathbf{R}^n$ and s the surfacic measure, with equality if and only if K is a ball.

The Brunn-Minkowski inequality is not only true for convex bodies but also for all compact sets and even for all measurable sets of $\mathbf{R}^n$ (with the little difficulty that the Minkowski sum of two mesurable sets is not necessary measurable). One way to prove it is to prove a functional inequality known as Prekopa-Leindler inequality which applied to characteristic functions of sets gives the multiplicative Brunn-Minkowski inequality

$$V_n((1-t)K + tL) \geq V_n(K)^{1-t} V_n(L)^t \tag{3}$$

where V_n is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{R}^n$, K and L two measurable sets of $\mathbf{R}^n$. By homogenity of the volume V_n, it can be shown that this a priori weak inequality is in fact equivalent to the n-dimensional one (1).

All this was to show that Brunn-Minkowski inequality has a very geometric meaning and it is natural to ask on which more general spaces than $\mathbf{R}^n$ the inequality can be extended.

One first answer is we can change the measure, for example a measure log-concave on $\mathbf{R}^n$ satisfy multiplicative Brunn Minkowski.

But to be able to quit $\mathbf{R}^n$, we have to generalize the Minkowski sum. This can be done on length spaces by using ideas of optimal transportation (refer to [3] for length space, [7] for optimal transporation, and for exemple [4] for this generalisation). Following an idea of this paper, for two sets K and L of a metric space X we define what we are going to call the s-intermediate set between K and L by

$$Z_s(K,L) = \left\{ z \in X ; \exists (k,l) \in K \times L,\ \begin{array}{rcl} d(k,z) & = & s d(k,l) \\ d(z,l) & = & (1-s) d(k,l) \end{array} \right\} \tag{4}$$

This set will play the role set of barycenters of the Minkowski sum. In fact the authors in [4] use it only for a Riemannian manifold but it makes sense for all metric spaces even if it is interesting only for length space. In this context we will say a metric measure space (X, d, m) satisfies the N-dimensionnal Brunn-Minkowski inequality if

$$m^{1/N}(Z_s(K,L)) \geq (1-s)\, m^{1/N}(K) + s\, m^{1/N}(L) \tag{5}$$

for all $0 < s < 1$ and K, L compacts of X. We will refer in the sequel at (5) as the "classical" N-dimensionnal Brunn-Minkowski inequality. It is proven in

[4] that a Riemannian manifold M of dimension n whose Ricci's curvature is always non negative satisfies (5) with dimension $N = n$ and with the canonical volume of the Riemannian manifold as measure, i.e.

$$vol(Z_s(K,L))^{1/n} \geq (1-s)vol(K)^{1/n} + s\, vol(L)^{1/n} \tag{6}$$

for all compacts K, L of M where vol denotes the canonical volume of the Riemannian manifold. In fact they obtain more precise results on functionnal inequalities like Prekopa-Leindler and Borell-Brascamp-Lieb inequalities.

Recently, there have been a lot of works on geometry of metric measure spaces. Lott-Villani and Sturm have given independently a synthetic treatment of metric spaces having Ricci curvature bounded below by k (see [7, 9, 10]). All these works began by the result of precompactness of Gromov: the class of Riemannian manifolds of dimension n and Ricci curvature bounded below by some constant k is precompact for a Gromov-Hausdorff metric. So the notion they develop for metric spaces has to generalize the one for Riemannian manifolds and has to be stable by Gromov-Hausdorff convergence. Their definition is about convexity properties of relative entropy on the Wasserstein space of probability and is linked with optimal transportation. Sturm in this context defines a Brunn Minkowski inequality with curvature k (see [10]).

The meaning of this inequality may be not totally satisfactory. Indeed the inequality is depending on parameter Θ which equals $\inf_{k\in K, l\in L} d(k,l)$ or $\sup_{k\in K, l\in L} d(k,l)$ whether the curvature is positive (or null) or negative. It corresponds to the minimal or maximal length of geodesics between the two compacts K and L. However this is a direct implication from its dimension-curvature condition $CD(k,N)$ and this is this inequality that gives all the geometric consequences of their theory like for example a Bishop-Gromov theorem on the growth of balls.

There is another weak concept of curvature which is known as metric contraction property (see [8, 10, 6]) and which is implied by this Brunn-Minkowski inequality at least in the case of curvature 0 and the $m \otimes m$ a.s. uniqueness of geodesics between two points of X.

As far as I know stability of Brunn-Minkowski inequality was not proven yet. This is the most interesting result we have in the paper (corollary 2.4). For simplicity we will work only with the classical Brunn-Minkowski (i.e. with curvature 0) and explains how to extend our results in the general case, with curvature k, in a remark. For doing this we introduce an approximated Brunn minkowski inequality since we need it during the proof. This fact is interesting in itself since it allows us to deal with discrete spaces.

In the second part of the paper we show that every metric measure space satisfying classical Brunn-Minkowski inequality can be approximated by discrete spaces with some approximated Brunn-Minkowski inequalities.

To avoid some problems between sets with zero measure we will work only with metric spaces (X,d,m) where (X,d) is Polish and m a Borel measure on (X,d) with full support, i.e. that charges every ball of X.

2 Stability of Brunn-Minkowski inequality

Definition 2.1. *Given $h \geq 0$ and $N \in \mathbf{N}, N \geq 1$, we say that a metric measure space (X, d, μ) satisfies the h Brunn-Minkowski inequality of dimension N denoted by $BM(N,h)$ if $\forall C_0, C_1 \subset X$ compacts, $\forall s \in [0,1]$, we have:*

$$\mu^{1/N}({C_s}^h) \geq (1-s)\,\mu^{1/N}(C_0) + s\,\mu^{1/N}(C_1) \tag{7}$$

where

$$C_s^h = \left\{ x \in X / \exists (x_0, x_1) \in C_0 \times C_1 / \begin{array}{ccc} |d(x_0,x) - s d(x_0,x_1)| & \leq & h \\ |d(x,x_1) - (1-s) d(x_0,x_1)| & \leq & h \end{array} \right\} \tag{8}$$

We call the set C_s^h the set of h(-approximated) s-intermediate points between C_0 and C_1. One can note that if X is a geodesic space and $h = 0$, it gives back the classical Brunn-Minkowski inequality for geodesic spaces. We shall often note $BM(N)$ instead of $BM(N,0)$. Another remark to be done is that this definition can be used for discrete spaces.
One can also note that if X satisfy $BM(N,h)$ it will also satisfy $BM(N,h')$ for all $h' \geq h$.
In these notes we use the following distance $\mathbf{D}$ between abstract metric measure spaces. We refer to [9] for its properties.

Definition 2.2. *Let (M,d,m) and (M',d',m') be two metric measure spaces, their distance $\mathbf{D}$ is given by*

$$\mathbf{D}((M,d,m),(M',d',m')) = \inf_{\hat{d},q} \left(\int_{M \times M'} \hat{d}^2(x,x') dq(x,y) \right)^{1/2}$$

where $\hat{d}$ is a pseudo metric on $M \sqcup M'$ which coincides with d on M and with d' on M' and q a coupling of the measures m and m'.

Theorem 2.3. *Let (X_n, d_n, m_n) be a sequence of compact metric measure spaces which converges with respect to the distance $\mathbf{D}$ to another compact metric measure space (X,d,m). If (X_n, d_n, m_n) satisfies $BM(N,h_n)$ with $h_n \to h$ when n goes to infinity, then (X,d,m) satisfies $BM(N,h)$.*

In particular for compact geodesic spaces it implies directly the stability of the classical Brunn-Minkowski inequality with respect to the $\mathbf{D}$-convergence:

Corollary 2.4. *Let (X_n, d_n, m_n) be a sequence of compact geodesic spaces which converges with respect to the distance $\mathbf{D}$ to another compact metric measure space (X,d,m), then X is also a geodesic space. If (X_n, d_n, m_n) satisfies $BM(N)$ then (X,d,m) satisfies also $BM(N)$.*

We will make the proof of theorem 2.3 only for compact sets of strictly positive measure. The remarks after the proof will give the inequality for all mesurable sets.

The idea of the proof is quite simple. We choose two compacts of the limit set X. Then we choose a good coupling of X_n and X and we construct two compacts of X_n by dilating these compacts with respect to the pseudo-distance of the coupling and taking the restriction of this two sets with X_n. The fact which makes things work is that the operation we did doesn't lose two much measure. So, we can define a s-intermediate set in X_n and apply Brunn-Minkowski inequality in X_n. By the same construction as before, we construct a set in the limit set X from the s-intermediate set in X_n without loosing a lot of measure. To conclude we have to study the link between this set and set of approximate s-intermediate points between initial compacts.

Proof of Theorem 2.3 Let C_0, C_1 two compacts of X of strictly positive measure. Let $s \in [0,1]$. Choose n so that $\mathbf{D}(X_n, X) \leq \frac{1}{2n}$. By definition of $\mathbf{D}$, there exists $\hat{d}$ a pseudo-metric on $X_n \sqcup X$ and q a coupling of m_n and m so that

$$\left(\int_{X_n \times X} \hat{d}^2(x,y)dq(x,y)\right)^{1/2} \leq \delta_n = \frac{1}{n}$$

For $\varepsilon_n > 0$ define $C_{n,i}^{\varepsilon_n} = \{x \in X_n / \hat{d}(x, C_i) \leq \varepsilon_n\}$ for $i = 1, 2$, these are compacts of X_n. They are indeed not empty for n large enough and ε_n well chosen, since being of strictly positive measure as we will see it. We have

$$\begin{aligned} m(C_0) &= q(X_n \times C_0) \\ &= q(C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n} \times C_0) + q(\{X_n \setminus C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n}\} \times C_0) \end{aligned}$$

But if $(x,y) \in \{X_n \setminus C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n}\} \times C_0$, then $\hat{d}(x,y) \geq \varepsilon_n$, so

$$\begin{aligned} q(\{X_n \setminus C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n}\} \times C_0) &\leq \int_{\{X_n \setminus C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n}\} \times C_0} \frac{\hat{d}^2(x,y)}{{\varepsilon_n}^2} dq(x,y) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta_n^2}{{\varepsilon_n}^2} \end{aligned}$$

which equals $\frac{1}{n}$ for $\delta_n = \frac{1}{n}$ and $\varepsilon_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$.

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} m_n(C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n}) &= q(C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n} \times X) \\ &\geq q(C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n} \times C_0) \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$m_n(C_{n,0}^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}}) \geq m(C_0) - \frac{1}{n} \tag{9}$$

and identically

$$m_n(C_{n,1}^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}}) \geq m(C_1) - \frac{1}{n}. \tag{10}$$

Now consider the set $C_{n,s}^{\varepsilon_n,h_n} \subset X_n$ defined as in the definition (2.1) by

$$C_{n,s}^{\varepsilon_n,h_n} = \left\{ x \in X_n / \exists (x_{n,0}, x_{n,1}) \in C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n} \times C_{n,1}^{\varepsilon_n} / \begin{array}{rcl} |d(x_{n,0}, x) - sd(x_{n,0}, x_{n,1})| & \leq & h_n \\ |d(x, x_{n,1}) - (1-s)d(x_{n,0}, x_{n,1})| & \leq & h_n \end{array} \right\}$$

This is the set of all the h_n s-intermediate points between $C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n}$ and $C_{n,1}^{\varepsilon_n}$. Since X_n satisfies $BM(N, h_n)$,

$$m_n^{\frac{1}{n}}(C_{n,s}^{\varepsilon_n,h_n}) \geq (1-s) m_n^{1/N}(C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n}) + s\, m_n^{1/N}(C_{n,1}^{\varepsilon_n}) \tag{11}$$

We can now define $C_s^{\varepsilon_n,h_n} \subset X$ by

$$C_s^{\varepsilon_n,h_n} = \{ y \in X, \exists x \in C_{n,s}^{\varepsilon_n,h_n} \hat{d}(x,y) \leq \varepsilon_n \}$$

Similary to (9) we have

$$m(C_s^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}},h_n}) \geq m_n(C_{n,s}^{\varepsilon_n}) - \frac{1}{n} \tag{12}$$

Now since $(x - \frac{1}{n})_+^{1/N} \geq x^{1/N} - (\frac{1}{n})^{1/N}$ for all $x \geq 0$, combining the inequalities (9), (10), (12) and (11) give us, for $\varepsilon_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} m^{1/N}(C_s^{\varepsilon_n,h_n}) & \geq & m_n^{1/N}(C_{n,s}^{\varepsilon_n,h_n}) - (\frac{1}{n})^{1/N} \\ & \geq & (1-s)\, m_n^{1/N}(C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n}) + s\, m_n^{1/N}(C_{n,1}^{\varepsilon_n}) - (\frac{1}{n})^{1/N} \\ & \geq & (1-s)\, m^{1/N}(C_0) + s\, m^{1/N}(C_1) - 2(\frac{1}{n})^{1/N} \end{array}$$

$C_s^{\varepsilon_n,h_n}$ is included in the set $K_s^{h_n+4\varepsilon_n}$ of all the $h_n + 4\varepsilon_n$ s-intermediate points between C_0 and C_1. Indeed, let $y \in C_s^{\varepsilon_n,h_n}$, by definition of this set, there exists $x \in C_{n,s}^{\varepsilon_n,h_n}$ so that $\hat{d}(x,y) \leq \varepsilon_n$. By definition of $C_{n,s}^{\varepsilon_n,h_n}$, it follows that there exists $(x_{n,0}, x_{n,1}) \in C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n} \times C_{n,1}^{\varepsilon_n}$ satisfying

$$\begin{array}{rcl} |d_n(x, x_{n,0}) - s\, d_n(x_{n,0}, x_{n,1})| & \leq & h_n \\ |d_n(x, x_{n,1}) - (1-s)\, d_n(x_{n,0}, x_{n,1})| & \leq & h_n. \end{array}$$

There exists, by definition of $C_{n,i}^{\varepsilon_n}$ for $i = 1, 2$, $(y_0, y_1) \in C_0 \times C_1$ with $\hat{d}(x_{n,0}, y_0) \leq \varepsilon_n$ and $\hat{d}(x_{n,1}, y_1) \leq \varepsilon_n$. It follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} |\hat{d}(y, y_0) - s\, \hat{d}(y_0, y_1)| & \leq & |\hat{d}(y, y_0) - \hat{d}(x, x_{n,0})| + |\hat{d}(x, x_{n,0}) - s\, \hat{d}(x_{n,0}, x_{n,1})| \\ & & + s\, |\hat{d}(y_0, y_1) - \hat{d}(x_{n,0}, x_{n,1})| \\ & \leq & h_n + 4\varepsilon_n. \end{array}$$

and

$$|\hat{d}(y, y_1) - (1-s)\, \hat{d}(y_0, y_1)| \leq h_n + 4\varepsilon_n.$$

The sequence $(h_n + \varepsilon_n)_n$ is converging to h. We can extract a monotone sequence from it which will still be denoted by $h_n + \varepsilon_n$. There are two cases. The first one is when the extracting subsequence is non-decreasing. Then we have $K_s^{h_n+4\varepsilon_n} \subset K_s^h$. So, for all n,

$$m^{1/N}(K_s^h) \geq m^{1/N}(K_s^{h_n+4\varepsilon_n}) \geq (1-s)\, m^{1/N}(C_0) + s\, m^{1/N}(C_1) - 2(\frac{1}{n})^{1/N}.$$

Letting n goes to infinity gives the conclusion.
The second one, more interesting, is when the extracted subsequence is non-increasing. Then we have

$$K_s^h = \bigcap_n K_s^{h_n+4\varepsilon_n}.$$

Indeed if $y \in \bigcap_n K_s^{h_n+4\varepsilon_n}$, for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $\exists (y_{n,0}, y_{n,1}) \in C_0 \times C_1$ so that

$$\begin{array}{lcl} |d(y, y_{n,0}) - s\, d(y_{n,0}, y_{n,1})| & \leq & h_n + 4\varepsilon_n \\ |d(y, y_{n,1}) - (1-s)\, d(y_{n,0}, y_{n,1})| & \leq & h_n + 4\varepsilon_n. \end{array}$$

By compactness of C_0 and C_1 we can extract another subsequence so that $y_{n,0} \to y_0 \in C_0$ and $y_{n,1} \to y_1 \in C_1$ and we have

$$\begin{array}{lcl} |d(y, y_0) - s\, d(y_0, y_1)| & \leq & h \\ |d(y, y_1) - (1-s)\, d(y_0, y_1)| & \leq & h \end{array}.$$

The other inclusion is immediate. This intersection is non-increasing so

$$m^{1/N}(K_s^h) = \lim_{n\to\infty} m^{1/N}(K_s^{h_n+4\varepsilon_n})$$

which gives the conclusion

$$m^{1/N}(K_s^h) \geq (1-s)\, m^{1/N}(C_0) + s\, m^{1/N}(C_1).$$

Remark

1. $BM(N)$ is directly implied by the condition $CD(O,N)$ of Sturm or Lott and Villani for the compact sets with a strictly positive measure (in fact for mesurable sets with strictly positive measure) (see [10]). But if the measure m is charging all the balls of the space and (if the space is geodesic), then the fact of having $BM(N)$ for all the compacts subspace with strictly positive measure implies $BM(N)$ for all compact subspaces. Indeed if (X, d, m) satifies $BM(N)$ for all the compact sets with a strictly positive measure and if the measure m is charging all the balls, if C_0, C_1 are compacts with $m(C_0) = 0$ and $m(C_1) > 0$ (the case $m(C_0) = m(C_1) = 0$ is trivial) and $s \in [0,1]$. Define $C_0^\varepsilon = \{y \in X, \exists x \in C_0 / d(x,y) \leq \varepsilon\}$, $m(C_0^\varepsilon) > 0$. Define H_s^ε the set of all the s-intermediate points between C_0^ε and C_1, By Brunn-Minkowski inequality we have:

$$m^{1/N}(H_s^\varepsilon) \geq (1-s)\, m^{1/N}(C_0^\varepsilon) + s\, m^{1/N}(C_1) \geq s\, m^{1/N}(C_1)$$

H_s^ε is included in $K_s^{2\varepsilon}$ the set of all 2ε s-intermediate points between C_0 and C_1. As before $\bigcap_{\varepsilon>0} K_s^{2\varepsilon}$ is an non-increasing intersection equal to K_s^0 the set of all the exact s-intermediate points between C_0 and C_1. So

$$m(K_s^0) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} K_s^{2\varepsilon}$$

which gives the annonced result. Consequently, on a metric measure space where the measure charges all the balls, $CD(0,N)$ implies $BM(N)$ for all compacts which in turns implies $MCP(0,N)$

2. In Polish spaces, Borel measures are regular which permits to pass from compact sets to measurable ones. More precisely, if a Polish space satisfy $BM(N,h)$ for all his compact subsets, it also satisfies it for all his measurable subsets. Therefore, if the spaces X_n and X are only Polish (no more compacts), the sets $C_{n,i}^{\varepsilon_n}$ for $i = 1, 2$ defined as above may be no more compacts. However they will still be measurable since closed, so (11) will still stay true in this more general context. We can, consequently, drop the assumption of compactness of X_n and X in the theorem (2.3) and its corollarry (2.4).

3. We can do the same for the Brunn-Minkowski inequality with curvature k by using the definition given in [10]. The only additional thing to do is to control the parameter Θ. But, with preceeding notations, we have $|\Theta(C_0, C_1) - \Theta(C_{n,0}^{\varepsilon_n}, C_{n,1}^{\varepsilon_n})| \leq 2\varepsilon_n$.

4. We can prove also the same theorem for the multiplicative Brunn-Minkowski inequality (3).

3 Discretizations of metric spaces

Let (M,d,m) be a given Polish measure space. For $h > 0$, let $M_h = \{x_i, i \geq 1\}$ be a countable subspace of M with $M = \bigcup_{i\geq 1} B_h(x_i)$. Choose $A_i \subset B_h(x_i), x_i \in A_i$ mutually disjoint and mesurable so that $\bigcup_{i\geq 1} A_i = M$. Consider the measure m_h on M_h given by $m_h(\{x_i\}) = m(A_i)$ for $i \geq 1$. We call (M_h, d, m_h) a discretization of (M,d,m).
It is proved in [2] that if $m(M) < \infty$ then

$$(M_h, d, m_h) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{D}} (M, d, m).$$

Theorem 3.1. *If (M,d,m) satisfies $BM(N)$ then (M_h,d,m_h) satisfies $BM(N,4h)$.*

The proof is based on the two following facts.

Lemma 3.2. *1. If $H \subset M_h$ then*

$$m(H^h) \geq m_h(H) \tag{13}$$

where $H^h = \{x \in M, d(x,H) \leq h\}$.

2. If $A \subset M$ mesurable and $A^h = \{x_i \in M_h, d(x_i, A) \leq h\}$ then

$$m_h(A^h) \geq m(A). \tag{14}$$

Proof of lemma 3.2

First, let $H \subset M_h$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_h(H) &= \sum_{i/x_i \in H} m(A_i) \\ &= m(\sqcup_{i/x_i \in H} A_i) \\ &\leq m(H^h) \end{aligned}$$

since $\sqcup_{i/x_i \in H} A_i \subset H^h = \{x \in M,\, d(x, H) \leq h\}$.
For the second point, let $A \subset M$ mesurable, define A^h as above, then

$$\begin{aligned} m_h(A^h) &= \sum_{i/x_i \in A^h} m(A_i) \\ &= m(\sqcup_{i/x_i \in A^h} A_i) \\ &\geq m(A) \end{aligned}$$

since $\sqcup_{i/x_i \in A^h} A_i \supset A$. Indeed if for some j, $A_j \cap A \neq \emptyset$ then there exists $a \in A$ with $d(x_j, a) \leq h$ so $x_j \in A^h$.

Proof ot theorem 3.1

Let H_0, H_1 be two compacts of M_h and $s \in [0, 1]$. H_0 and H_1 consist of a finite or countable number of points x_j. Define $H_0^h, H_1^h \subset M$ by $H_i^h = \{x \in M, \exists x_j \in H_i / d(x_j, x) \leq h\}$ for $i = 1, 2$. By the first point of the lemma, for $i = 1, 2$

$$m(H_i^h) \geq m_h(H_i). \tag{15}$$

Let $(H^h)_s \subset M$ be the set of all the s-intermediate points between H_0^h and H_1^h in the entire space M, i.e.

$$(H^h)_s = \left\{ x \in M, \exists (x_0, x_1) \in H_0^h \times H_1^h / \left| \begin{array}{ccc} d(x, x_0) & = & s\, d(x_0, x_1) \\ d(x, x_1) & = & (1 - s)\, d(x_0, x_1) \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

$BM(N)$ inequality on M gives us

$$m^{1/N}((H^h)_s) \geq (1 - s) m^{1/N}(H_0^h) + s\, m^{1/N}(H_1^h). \tag{16}$$

As before by triangular inequality, we can see $(H^h)_s$ is include in the set $\tilde{C}_s^{3h}$ of $3h$ s-intermediaire points in the whole space M between H_0 and H_1. So the set $\tilde{H}_s^{4h} \subset M_h$ of $4h$ s-intermediate points between H_0 and H_1 in the discrete space M_h contains the restriction at M_h of the h dilated of $(H^h)_s$. By the second point of the lemma we have

$$m_h(\tilde{H}_s^{4h}) \geq m((H^h)_s). \tag{17}$$

Combining inequalities (15), (16) and (17) ends the proof of the theorem.

Remark If (M, d, m) satisfies $BM(N, k)$ then (M_h, d, m_h) satisfies $BM(N, k+4h)$.

References

[1] F. Barthe, *Autour de l'inégalité de Brunn-Minkowski.* Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6), (**2003**) vol 12, 27–178

[2] A.I. Bonciocat and K.T. Sturm, *Mass transportation and rough curvature bounds for discrete spaces.* Preprint

[3] D. Burago, Y. Burago and S. Ivanov, *A course in metric geometry.* Graduate Studies in Mathematics 33. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.(**2001**)

[4] D.Cordero-Erausquin , R. McCann and M. Schmuckenschläger , *A Riemannian interpolation inequality à la Borell, Brascamp and Lieb.* Invent. Math. (**2001**) vol 146, 219–257,

[5] R.J. Gardner, *The Brunn-Minkowski inequality.* Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society (**2001**) vol 39, n° 3, 355-405

[6] N. Juillet *Geometric Inequalities and Generalised Ricci Bounds in Heisenberg Group*, preprint

[7] J. Lott and C. Villani, *Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport.* Ann. of Math. (to appear).

[8] S.I. Ohta *On the measure contraction property of metric measure spaces* Comment. Math. Helv. (**2007**) Comment. Math. Helv. vol 82, 805–828

[9] K.T. Sturm, *On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I.* Acta Math., in press.

[10] K.T. Sturm, *On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II.* Acta Math., in press.

[11] C. Villani *Topics in optimal transportation.* Graduate Studies in Mathematics 58. American Mathematical Society (**2003**)